

## REMARKS

Claims 1-4, 12, 13, 16, 17, 21 and 25 were presented for examination. All claims were rejected.

Claims 2, 12, 13, 16, 17 and 21 have been amended, consistent with the specification, to more succinctly define the invention and to correct errors. No new matter has been added.

**Rejection under 35 USC §112**

Claims 2 and 21 are rejected under 35 USC §112 ¶2.

Claim 2 has been amended to be consistent with the specification to recite an electric field as a displacing force (p. 5, 12-15).

Claim 21 has been amended to correct an error, deleting an incorrect reference to Claim 16 and replacing with correct Claim 18.

Applicants urge that the rejection has been cured and request reconsideration and withdrawal.

**Rejection under 35 USC §103**

Claims 1-4, 12, 13, 16, 17, 21 and 25 are rejected under 35 USC §103(a) over Bhargava (5,665,568) and Bhargava (5,665,568) in view of Furber (5,986,554). Applicants traverse the rejection.

Claims 1, 12, 13, 16, 17, 21 and 25 all explicitly recite a mobile polymer monolith disposed in a microchannel, wherein the polymer monolith is made by polymerizing a monomer mixture within the microchannel.

Bhargava teaches a float designed to slide up and down on a guide rod (col. 3, 9-12). Notwithstanding the fact that Bhargava nowhere

teaches a polymer monolith disposed within a microchannel, there is no teaching or suggestion whatsoever of the claim limitation that the polymer monolith is made within a microchannel by polymerizing a monomer mixture.

It is well settled that to establish the prima facie obviousness of a claimed invention all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. The prior art must disclose the invention as a whole. As Applicants have shown above, such is not the case here. Applicants urge that a prima facie case of obviousness has not been made and accordingly request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection.

## CONCLUSION

The rejection of claims 1-4, 12, 13, 16, 17, 21 and 25 under 35 USC §§103 and 112 having been overcome, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection, and that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 01/09/2003

  
Donald A. Nissen  
Registration No. 44,261  
Sandia National Laboratories  
P. O. Box 969, MS 9031  
Livermore, CA 94551-0969  
Telephone (925) 443-7535

## Certificate of Mailing Under 37 CFR §1.8

I hereby certify that this Correspondence and documents referred to herein were deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail addressed to:  
Commissioner of Patents, PO Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on the date shown below.

Date of Deposit: 7-18-03

Person making Deposit DORA DA ROSA

Signature DORA DA ROSA

Application No: 09/695,816

For Applicant: Hasselbrink, Jr.